UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/033,146	10/27/2001	Mingte Chen	M-11528-3P US	7132

60975   7590   11/15/2007

CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE
BLDG. H, SUITE 250
AUSTIN, TX 78758

EXAMINER .
JOO, JOSHUA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/033,146	CHEN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Joshua Joo	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 August 2007*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-3,6-23,25-34,36-45,47-55,58 and 60-67* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-3, 6-23, 25-34, 36-45, 47-55, 58, 60-67* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *28 October 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Response to Communication dated 8/30/2007

1.   Claims 1-3, 6-23, 25-34, 36-45, 47-55, 58, 60-67 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 8/30/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that:

3.   (1) As to claim 1, unlike portions of Gupta, the incoming event is not intended to cause a server to generate an indication of a message's receipt, but to indicate the fact that the web browser is now available for having an asynchronous message pushed thereto.

4.   In response, claim 1 recites, regarding the incoming event, "causing a web server to push an asynchronous message to the web browser in response to an incoming event, wherein the incoming event is an event other than a request for information from the web server..." The claim does not specify that the incoming event is to indicate that the web browser is available for having an asynchronous message pushed thereto or the implied feature that the incoming event is sent from the web browser. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

5.   (2) The claimed web browser does not, and indeed not, make any request for information from the claimed web server. The claimed web browser notifies the claimed web server of the claimed web browser's availability to receive information pushed from the claimed web server. Neither the claimed web browser, nor any other portion of the claimed invention, need perform any request for information from the claimed web server, in order to receive the requisite information.

6.   In response, the claim does not expressly provide language that limits the interpretation of the

claims such that the web browser need not perform any request for information from the claimed web

browser.   If Applicant is relying on the limitation of "the incoming event is an event other than a request

for information from the web server" as said language, it is noted that there is no mention of indicating

any availability to receive information or that the web browser sends the incoming event.   Prior art

references that request information teach the scopes of the claims.

7.   (3) Nowhere in Gupta is there shown, taught or suggest the claimed capability of a web browser

to moderate information asynchronously pushed from a web server.

8.   In response, Gupta teaches of providing a list of desired messages (col. 5, lines 45-49; col. 6, lines

15-21) that are to be asynchronously pushed. Gupta also teaches registering the client's identity and

receiving address to receive messages and updating the list of desired messages (col. 5, lines 45-56).

Therefore, Gupta teaches of moderating information asynchronously pushed from a web server.

9.   (4) Neither Gupta or Omoigui teach of 1) causing any server to wait in providing any information

whatsoever; 2) a web browser that sends a message to cause a server to wait; or 3) the need for such

control in the case of information being asynchronously pushed from a web-server to a web browser.

10.   In response, claim 1 discloses features of sending a wait request and associating the wait request

with a source. The claim does not recite any feature of causing any server to wait in providing any

information or sending a message to cause a server to wait. When interpreting the wait request, there is

no actual function of the wait request or the wait request causing any action, such as causing the server to

wait, other than associating the wait request with the source or assigning the wait request to session.

Gupta teaches of a client registering (requesting) to receive messages (col. 5, lines 49-56) and waiting to

receive to receive messages (col. 8, lines 26-29). Omoigui teaches of registering and unregistering receipt

notifications, providing criteria which are notifications are to take place, and changing parameters (col.

10, lines 56-63; col. 14, lines 50-56).   The client requesting or editing to receive messages is considered as the claimed "wait request".

11.   (5) The Office action fails to satisfy the burden of factually supporting the alleged motivation to combine the two references.   Evidence must therefore be provided to suggest the combination. Even if there was reason to combine the references, the distinguishing of one indication from another in no way teaches the claimed control over information being asynchronously pushed from a web server to a web browser, by the web browser.

12.   In response, KSR forecloses the argument that a specific teaching, suggestion, or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness. See the recent Board decision *Ex parte Smith*, --USPQ2d--, slip op. at 20, (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. June 25, 2007) (citing *KSR*, 82 USPQ2d at 1396) (available at https://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/bpai/prec/fd071923.pdf).

13.   Gupta teaches of providing a list of desired messages (col. 5, lines 45-49; col. 6, lines 15-21) that are to be asynchronously pushed. Gupta also teaches registering the client's identity and receiving address to receive messages and updating the list of desired messages (col. 5, lines 45-56). Omoigui teaches of registering and unregistering receipt notifications, providing criteria which notifications are to take place, and changing parameters (col. 10, lines 56-63; col. 14, lines 50-56). Gupta and Omoigui teach control over information being asynchronously pushed from a server to a client.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this

subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

14.   · Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta et al, US Patent #6,763,384 (Gupta hereinafter).

15.   As per claim 22, Gupta teaches the invention as claimed including a method for communicating, Gupta's teachings comprising:

controlling a user interface presented by a web browser comprising (col. 5, lines 35-39. Web browser.):

causing the web browser to provide a wait request to a web server, wherein the wait request is associated with the web browser and a target from which an asynchronous message originates (col. 5, lines 49-56. Register to receive messages. Identify client process. col. 8, lines 31-36. Inform server of event. Send message based on registered client process and event from one of the application servers.);

generating the asynchronous message, the asynchronous message identifying the web browser as a recipient of the asynchronous message, the generating being performed by the target (Col 6, lines 54-61. Application server detects message/event of interest.);

providing the asynchronous message to the web server (Col 6, lines 54-61. Application server passes message to notification server.); and

causing the web server to push the asynchronous message to the web browser in response to an incoming event, wherein the incoming event is an event other than a request for information from the web server (Col 6, lines 54-61. Notification server sends message to clients based on messages/events from application servers.),

the web browser presents a user interface change in response to the asynchronous message (Col 6, lines 60-61. Display messages.); and

the incoming event is received by a communication server (Col 5, lines 31-35, 41-45; Col 6, lines 54-56. Application server detects messages/events and sends messages/events to the notification server).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

17.   Claims 1-3, 6-14, 16-17, 19-21, 23, 25-31, 33-34, 36-42, 44-45, 47-53, 55, 58, and 60-66 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta, in view of Omoigui, US Patent

#6,694,352 (Omoigui hereinafter).

18.   As per claim 1, 16, 20, 23, 33, 44, 45, 55, and 58, Gupta teaches substantially the invention as

claimed including a method for communication, Gupta's teachings comprising:

controlling a user interface presented by a web browser comprising:

registering the web browser as available to receive an asynchronous message, wherein the web

browser is not blocked waiting for the asynchronous message (col. 5, lines 45-56. Register to receive

messages.); and

pushing instructions to cause a web server to push an asynchronous message to the web browser

in response to an incoming event, wherein the incoming event is an event other than a request for

information from the web server (col. 6, lines 54-61. Notification server sends message to clients based

on messages/events from application servers.) ,

the web browser presents a user interface change in response to the asynchronous message (col.

6, lines 60-61. Display messages.), and

the incoming event is received by a communication server (col. 6, lines 54-59. Application server

detects messages/events and sends messages/events to the notification server.).

cause the web browser to provide a wait request to the web server, the wait request being

associated with the web browser (col. 5, lines 49-56. Register to receive messages.);

associating the wait request with a "message from a source", wherein the associating identifies

the web browser as a recipient of the message (col. 6, lines 15-24; Col 8, lines 34-39. Determine

recipients by using list of desired messages with list of intended clients.).

19.   Gupta does not specifically teach of identifying a source of the message and associating the wait

request with the source.

Omoigui teaches a similar system for providing notifications comprising: requesting notification

of events by providing user information, identifying a source of a message, and associating the source of

the message with the user information (col. 9, lines 13-25; col. 11, lines 15-29).

20.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to combine the teachings of Gupta and Omoigui to identify the source and associate the source of the

message with user information. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Omoigui's

teachings would allow distinguishing of messages received from different sources and determine which

clients to send notifications (col. 11, lines 22-27).

21.   As per claim 19, Gupta teaches the invention as claimed including a method for communication,

Gupta's teachings comprising:

establishing a first connection between a web browser and a web server (col. 5, lines 45-53; col.

6, lines 59-61. Client communicates with notification server.);

establishing a second connection between the web server and a business process server (col. 6,

lines 54-59. Notification server connected to application server.);

controlling a user interface presented by the web browser comprising:

registering the web browser with the business process server (col. 5, lines 31-35, 41-45; col. 6, lines 54-56. Register to receive messages.);

providing the web server with an asynchronous message to push to the web browser, the providing being performed by the business process server (col. 6, lines 54-61. Send messages/events to notification server.) and the providing being performed in response to an incoming event, wherein the incoming event is an event other than a request for information from the web browser (col. 6, lines 54-56. Detect messages/events of interest.); and

causing the web server to push the asynchronous message to the browser (Col 6, lines 54-61. Send notification message to clients.); wherein the web browser performs a user interface change in response to the asynchronous message (col. 6, lines 60-61. Display messages.); and

the incoming event is received by a communication server (col. 5, lines 31-35; col. 6, lines 54-56. Detection of messages/events by application server. col. 6, lines 35-39. Change in bid.).

causing the web browser to provide a wait request to the web server, the wait request being associated with the web browser (col. 5, lines 49-56. Register to receive messages.);

associating the wait request with a "message from a source", wherein the associating identifies the web browser as a recipient of the message (col. 6, lines 15-24; col. 8, lines 34-39. Determine recipients by using list of desired messages with list of intended clients.).

22.   Gupta does not specifically teach of identifying a source of the message and associating the wait request with the source.

Omoigui teaches a similar system for providing notifications comprising: requesting notification of events by providing user information, identifying a source of a message, and associating the source of the message with the user information (col. 9, lines 13-25; col. 11, lines 15-29).

23.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to combine the teachings of Gupta and Omoigui to identify the source and associate the source of the

message with user information. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Omoigui's

teachings would allow distinguishing of messages received from different sources and determine which

clients to send notifications (col. 11, lines 22-27).

24.   As per claim 21, Gupta teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a method for

communicating, Gupta's teachings comprising:

        controlling a user interface presented by a web browser comprising:

        causing the web browser to provide a wait request to a web server, the wait request being

associated with the web browser (col. 5, lines 49-56. Register to receive messages.);

        associating the wait request with "a message received from a source", wherein the associating

identifies the web browser as a recipient of the asynchronous message (col. 8, lines 30-49. Identify

recipients to send notifications. col. 8, lines 12-14. Provide list of desired messages from different

sites.); and

        pushing the asynchronous message to the web browser in response to an incoming event, wherein

the incoming event is an event other than a request for information from the web server (col. 6, lines 54-

61. Notification server sends message to clients based on messages/events from application servers.), and

        the browser presents a user interface change in response to the asynchronous message (col. 6,

lines 60-61. Display messages.);

        the incoming event is received by a communication server (col. 6, lines 54-59. Application server

passes messages/events to the notification server.);

25.   Gupta teaches of associating the wait request with the browser and identifying the web browser as

a recipient of the asynchronous message. Gupta does not specifically teach identifying a source of an

asynchronous message; and associating the wait request with the source, wherein the associating

identifies the web browser as a recipient of the asynchronous message. Gupta also does not explicitly

teach of a repeat step of causing the web browser to provide a wait request to the web server; identifying a

source of the asynchronous message; and associating the wait request with the source, wherein the

associating identifies the web browser as a recipient of the asynchronous message.

Omoigui teaches a similar system for providing notifications comprising: requesting notification

of events by providing user information, identifying a source of a message, and associating the source of

the message with the user information, and sending subsequent requests to modify/change criteria for

subscription (col. 9, lines 13-25; col. 11, lines 15-29; col. 14, lines 50-57).

26.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to combine the teachings of Gupta and Omoigui to identify the source and associate the source of the

message with user information. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Omoigui's

teachings would allow distinguishing of messages received from different sources and determine which

clients to send notifications (col. 11, lines 22-27). It would have been also obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to combine the teachings to send an addition request (the other wait request) and associate

the request with an identified source, wherein the associating identifies the user as recipient of

asynchronous messages. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Omoigui's teachings

would allow a user to control receipt of notifications.

27.   As per claim 34, Gupta teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a computer

system comprising:

        a processor; a memory, the memory storing instructions for executing on the processor, the

instructions comprising (col. 5, lines 36-41. Browser on computer.):

        controlling instructions to control a user interface presented by a web browser comprising

pushing instructions to cause a web server to push an asynchronous message to the web browser in response to an incoming event (col. 6, lines 54-61. Notification server sends message to clients based on messages/events from application servers.),

wherein the web browser presents a user interface change in response to the asynchronous message (col. 6, lines 60-61. Display messages.), and

the incoming event is received by a communication server (col. 6, lines 54-59. Application server detects messages/events and sends messages/events to the notification server.).

providing instructions to cause the web browser to provide a wait request to the web server, the wait request being associated with the web browser (col. 5, lines 49-56. Register to receive messages.);

providing instructions to associate the wait request with a "message from a source", wherein the associating identifies the web browser as a recipient of the message (col. 6, lines 15-24; Col 8, lines 34-39. Determine recipients by using list of desired messages with list of intended clients.).

28.   Gupta does not specifically teach of identifying a source of the message and associating the wait request with the source.

Omoigui teaches a similar system for providing notifications comprising: requesting notification of events by providing user information, identifying a source of a message, and associating the source of the message with the user information (col. 9, lines 13-25; col. 11, lines 15-29).

29.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gupta and Omoigui to identify the source and associate the source of the message with user information. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Omoigui's teachings would allow distinguishing of messages received from different sources and determine which clients to send notifications (col. 11, lines 22-27).

30.   As per claim 2, Gupta teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising: generating the asynchronous message (col. 6, lines 59-61; col. 8, lines 37-40. Send messages. It is inherent that the messages are generated in order to sent to the client.).

31.   As per claim 3, Gupta teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising: preparing to receive the asynchronous message (col. 6, lines 59-61. Client receives and displays messages. col. 7, lines 10-13. Server opens connection with client.).

32.   As per claim 6, Gupta teaches the invention comprising:

generating instructions to generate the asynchronous message, the asynchronous message identifying the wait request, wherein the identifying identifies the web browser as a recipient of the message (col. 6, lines 21-24. Generate notification. col. 8, lines 34-40. Notification for registered receiving address identifier.); and

message providing instructions to provide the asynchronous message to the web server (col. 8, lines 31-40. Notification generated for client process and sent.).

33.   As per claims 25, 36, 47, and 60, Gupta teaches the invention comprising:

generating instructions to generate the asynchronous message, the asynchronous message identifying the wait request, wherein the identifying identifies the web browser as a recipient of the message (col. 6, lines 21-24. Generate notification. col. 8, lines 34-40. Notification for registered receiving address identifier.); and message providing instructions to provide the asynchronous message to the web server (col. 8, lines 31-40. Notification generated for client process and sent.). Gupta teaches of the web request being associated with the web browser. Gupta does not explicitly teach of a repeat step request providing instructions to cause the web browser to provide a wait request to the web server.

Omoigui teaches a similar system for providing notifications, wherein the user is able to send

subsequent requests to modify/change criteria for subscription (col. 9, lines 13-25; col. 11, lines 15-29;

col. 14, lines 50-57).

34.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings Gupta and

Omoigui for the web browser to send an addition request (the "second" wait request). The motivation for

the suggested combination is that Omoigui's teachings would allow a user to control receipt of

notifications.

35.   As per claim 7, Gupta teaches the method of claim 6, wherein causing the web browser to provide

the wait request comprises: downloading requesting instructions to the web browser, wherein

downloading causes the web browser to execute the requesting instructions (col. 5, lines 60-col. 6, lines 9.

Download client process and invoke client process automatically or manually.).

36.   As per claims 8, 26, 37, 48, and 61, Gupta teaches the invention comprising:

storing instructions to store a reference to a callback function with information from the wait

request (col. 5, lines 49-56; col. 8, lines 18-24. Registers receiving identifier. Col 8, lines 15-17. Enroll

to receive messages.); and

using instructions to use the reference to call the callback function when the message is provided

to the web server, wherein the callback function pushes the message (col. 8, lines 34-40. Sends

events/messages received from application server using receiving identifier of client.).

37.   As per claims 9, 27, 38, 49, and 62, Gupta teaches the invention comprising: context providing

instructions to provide the callback function with context information, the context information identifying

the web browser (col. 5, lines 41-56; col. 8, lines 18-24. Registers receiving identifier and list of desired messages. col. 8, lines 15-17. Enroll to receive messages.).

38.   As per claims 10, 11, 28, 39, 50, and 63, Gupta teaches the invention comprising:

assigning instructions to assign the wait request to a connection between the web server and a business process server (col. 6, lines 12-24. Notification server correlates registered client identity with messages received from application server. col. 8, lines 34-37. Determine recipients for notification when provided with messages/events.); and

listening instructions to listen to the connection for the message (col. 6, lines 54-56. Inform notification server of messages/events from application server.).

39.   As per claims 12, 29, 40, 51, and 64, Gupta teaches the invention comprising: calling instructions to call a callback function associated with the web browser when the message is received, wherein the callback function pushes the message (col. 5, lines 49-56; Col 8, lines 18-24. Registers receiving identifier. Col. 8, lines 15-17. Enroll to receive messages. col. 8, lines 34-40. Sends events/messages received from application server using receiving identifier of client.).

40.   As per claims 13, 30, 41, 52, and 65, Gupta teaches the invention comprising:

reference storing instructions to store a reference to the callback function (col. 5, lines 41-56; Col 8, lines 18-24. Registers receiving identifier and list of desired messages. col. 8, lines 15-17. Enroll to receive messages.) and

reference using instructions to use the reference for calling the callback function (col. 6, lines 54-56. Identify events/messages of interest to clients. col. 8, lines 34-40. Send events/messages received from application server using receiving identifier of client.);

41.   As per claims 14, 31, 42, 53, and 66, Gupta teaches the invention comprising:

context storing instruction to store a second reference to context information, the context

information identifying the web browser (col. 5, lines 54-56. Identifier could be address and port with the

protocol.) and

context using instructions to use the second reference for providing the context information to the

callback function (col. 8, lines 34-40. Send events/messages received from application server using

receiving identifier of client.).

42.   As per claim 17, Gupta teaches the method of claim 16, wherein the message includes an action

instruction to cause the web browser to perform the action (col. 6, lines 59-61. Display message.).

43.   Claims 15, 18, 32, 43, 54, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Gupta and Omoigui, view of Boyle et al, US Patent #6,138,158 (Boyle hereinafter).

44.   As per claims 15, 18, 32, 43, 54, and 67, Gupta teaches of causing a first user interface object to

move to visually capture a user's attention. Gupta does not specifically teach of causing a second user

interface object to issue a sound to capture the user's attention and presenting a screen pop of data; and

bringing a web browser window to a front of screen.

Boyle teaches of pushing data to mobile devices where upon receiving message, the device

produces a sound to capture the user's attention and a notification is prompted to the screen (Col 6, lines

5-6; Col 10, line 59-Col 11, line 14)..

45.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to combine the suggested system of Gupta and Omoigui with the teachings of Boyle to produce a sound

and display a notification on the screen. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Boyle's

teachings would improve the system by providing different sensory alerts to make the user aware of

received notification messages (col. 10, lines 59-61).

NATHAN FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Conclusion

46.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set

forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from

the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing

date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX

MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

47.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be

reached on Monday to Friday 7 to 4.

48.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned 571-273-8300.

49.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

November 7, 2007
JJ